UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/697,956 | 10/30/2003 | Thomas S. Mason | D-1173 R | 7798 |

28995 7590 06/24/2009

RALPH E. JOCKE
walker & jocke LPA
231 SOUTH BROADWAY
MEDINA, OH 44256

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| KIM, TAE W | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2887 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 06/24/2009 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/697,956 | MASON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | TAE W. KIM | 2887 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed on March 2, 2009.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 13, 15-19, 22, 23-28, 30, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watari (US 20010003345 A1) in view of Sawada (US 5835816 A) in view of Motomura (US 4521102 A).

Re claim 1: Watari discloses a method of operating an automated banking machine adapted to dispense cash (fig 2 & 3), and to provide receipts for transactions conducted with the machine (24 in fig 3, par 0048).

However, Watari does not disclose or fairly suggest

a) sensing failure to deliver a first receipt from the machine that is associated with a first transaction conducted through operation of the machine,

b) sensing failure to deliver a second receipt from the machine that is associated with a second transaction conducted through operation of the machine sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first receipt remains in the machine; and

c) operating at least one computer of the machine to cause generation of at least one receipt signal responsive to the occurrence of both (a) and (b).

Sawada however discloses

a) sensing failure to deliver a first paper from the machine that is associated with a first transaction conducted through operation of the machine (S17-S18 in fig 6B),

b) sensing failure to deliver a second paper from the machine that is associated with a second transaction conducted through operation of the machine sequentially immediately after the first transaction (S17-S18 in fig 6B),

c) operating at least one computer (26 & 27 in fig 3, col 5 lines 21-37: Comparator and Jam Alarm Counter conduct calculations on the input variables) of the machine to cause generation of at least one signal responsive to the occurrence of both (a) and (b) (steps S20-S21 in fig 6B, col 6 lines 21-26: the pre-selected value can be any value including "2").

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Sawada's teaching in Watari's method for the purpose of determining whether a serviceman needs to be dispatched.

In addition, Motomura discloses delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine (col 5 lines 18-20: "two copy papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper transport path": This condition can be achieved only by a step of delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Motomura's teaching in the method of Watari

modified by Sawada for the purpose of trying to loosen the first paper jam by causing a friction with a second sheet of paper.

Re claim 2: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 1.

However, Watari does not disclose or fairly suggest

(d) prior to step (a), sending the first receipt in a receipt path toward a receipt outlet of the machine, (e) prior to step (b), sending the second receipt in the receipt path toward the receipt outlet responsive to step (a), (f) subsequent to step (b) and prior to step (c), determining a receipt jam in the machine responsive to the occurrence of both step (a) and step (b)

Sawada however further discloses

(d) prior to step (a), sending the first receipt in a receipt path toward a receipt outlet of the machine (fig 2, col 4 lines 1-25: "paper transport path", "Subsequently, the paper or copy P is driven out of the copier 1."),

(e) prior to step (b), sending the second receipt in the receipt path toward the receipt outlet responsive to step (a) (fig 2, col 4 lines 1-25: "paper transport path", "Subsequently, the paper or copy P is driven out of the copier 1."),

(f) subsequent to step (b) and prior to step (c), determining a receipt jam in the machine responsive to the occurrence of both step (a) and step (b) (steps S20 in fig 6B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Sawada's additional teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura for the purpose of determining whether a serviceman needs to be dispatched.

Re claim 3: Watari modified by Sawada discloses the method according to claim 2, further comprising responsive to step (a), determining that the first receipt is jammed in the machine (S17-S18 in fig 6B),

However, Watari modified by Sawada does not disclose step (e) includes sending the second receipt while the first receipt remains jammed in the machine.

Motomura however discloses step (e) includes sending the second receipt while the first receipt remains jammed in the machine (col 5 lines 18-20: "two copy papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper transport path").

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Motomura's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada for the purpose of trying to loosen the first paper jam by causing a friction with a second sheet of paper.

Re claim 5: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein the at least one receipt events signal includes a receipt jam signal (par 0137), wherein step (c) includes generating the receipt jam signal (par 0137).

Re claim 6: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim l wherein (a) further includes

(i) printing a first receipt with a printer in the machine (par 0053: "The receipt dispensing outlet 24, connected to the RPU (not shown), dispenses a detailed statement of use (i.e., receipt) which indicates a result of transaction."),

(ii) moving the first receipt to adjacent a receipt outlet (24 in fig 3, par 0048) of the machine, wherein receipts (par 0053),

Watari however further discloses that the bill are sensed adjacent the bill dispensing outlet (par 0138) and generally extend through the bill dispensing outlet and are accessible to a machine user (par 0142; "bills 41 projected from the bill dispensing outlet…") and (iii) sensing that the first bill adjacent the bill dispensing outlet is not removed within a first time period, after the first bill is moved adjacent to the bill dispensing outlet (par 0145).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Watari's teaching about the steps of detecting bills adjacent the bill dispensing outlet to the method of Watari modified by Sawada with regard to dispensing receipts for the purpose of being able to detect when a user does not take the receipt.

Re claim 7: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 6 wherein (b) includes

(iv) printing the second receipt with the printer, (par 0053: "The receipt dispensing outlet 24, connected to the RPU (not shown), dispenses a detailed statement of use (i.e., receipt) which indicates a result of transaction."),

(v) moving the second receipt to adjacent the receipt outlet (24 in fig 3, par 0048). These are steps already discloses under claim 6, but with a second receipt. It is obvious that these steps are not confined to be executed only one time for only one single receipt. Therefore, it is obvious that these steps would repeat for a second receipt.

Watari however further discloses disclose that at least one of the first bill and second bill is adjacent the bill dispensing outlet (par 0138) a second time period after the second receipt is moved adjacent to the receipt outlet (par 0145). These are steps already discloses under claim 6,

but with a second receipt and a second time period. It is obvious that these steps are not confined to be executed only one time for only one single receipt in Watari. Therefore, it is obvious that these steps would repeat for a second receipt and a second time period.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Watari's teaching about the steps of detecting bills adjacent the bill dispensing outlet to the method of Watari modified by Sawada with regard to dispensing receipts for the purpose of being able to detect when a user does not take the receipt.

Re claim 11: Watari modified by Sawada and Graef discloses the method according to claim 1 and further comprising:

(d) responsive to step (a), determining that the first receipt is jammed in the machine (steps S17 in fig 6B); and

(e) subsequent to step (d) and prior to step (b), attempting to deliver the second receipt from the machine (S12 in fig 6A) while the first receipt remains jammed in the machine (col 5 lines 18-20: "two copy papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper transport path": This condition can be achieved only by a step of delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine).

Re claim 13: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 11 wherein step (b) includes sensing failure to deliver (S17 in fig 6B) the second receipt from the machine while the first receipt remains jammed ion the machine (Motomura: col 5 lines 18-20: "two copy papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper

transport path": This condition can be achieved only by a step of delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine).

Re claim 15: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 7 wherein (a) includes subsequent to (iii) and prior to (iv), (vii) attempting to retract the first receipt in the machine away from the receipt outlet through operation of a receipt retraction device in the machine (1022 in fig 15B, par 0145).

Re claim 16: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 15 wherein (a) includes subsequent to (vii) and prior to (iv), (viii) sensing that the first receipt is not retracted away from the receipt outlet through operation of the receipt retraction device in (vii) (1022 in fig 15B, par 0145: if the user takes all of the bills, then this would be the case).

Re claim 17: Watari modified by Sawada discloses the method accor1ding to claim 15 wherein (a) includes prior to (iv), sensing that the first receipt is retracted away from the receipt outlet through operation of the receipt retraction device (1022 in fig 15B, par 0145).

Re claim 18: Watari discloses a method of operating an automated banking machine adapted to dispense cash (fig 2 & 3) and to provide receipts for transactions conducted with the machine (24 in fig 3, par 0048).

However, Watari does not disclose or fairly suggest

(a) sending a first receipt in a receipt path toward a receipt outlet of the machine

(d) determining whether the first receipt becomes freed from the jammed condition in response to step (c); and (e) responsive to a negative determination in step (d), generating a signal indicative of a machine malfunction.

Sawada however discloses

(a) sending a first paper in a receipt path toward a paper outlet of the machine (fig 2, col 4 lines 1-25: "paper transport path", "Subsequently, the paper or copy P is driven out of the copier 1.");

(d) determining whether the first paper becomes freed from the jammed condition in response to step (c) (S15 in fig 6B: determining whether preceding jam condition was removed is obvious in light of the step S15 that decrement the jam count based on the result that the copy count has reaches the Alarm Level (any assigned number) in step S13); and

(e) responsive to a negative determination in step (d), generating a signal indicative of a machine malfunction (S17-S22 in fig 6B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Sawada's teaching in Watari's method for the purpose of determining whether a serviceman needs to be sent.

However, Watari modified by Sawada does not disclose

(c) responsive to step (b) and while the first receipt remains in the jammed condition in the machine, sending a second receipt in the receipt path toward the receipt outlet, wherein the second receipt sequentially immediately follows the first receipt in the receipt path;

Motomura however discloses

(c) responsive to step (b) and while the first paper remains in the jammed condition in the machine, sending a second paper in the paper path toward the paper outlet, wherein the second paper sequentially immediately follows the first paper in the paper path (col 5 lines 18-20: "two

copy papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper transport path").

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Motomura's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada for the purpose of trying to loosen the first paper jam by causing a friction with a second sheet of paper.

Re claim 19: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 18 and further comprising: (f) prior to (a), printing the first receipt, through operation of the machine, (g) subsequent to (f), printing the second receipt through operation of the machine (par 0046: "a receipt printer unit (RPU)", par 0053: "The receipt dispensing outlet 24, connected to the RPU (not shown), dispenses a detailed statement of use (i.e., receipt)).

Re claim 22: Watari discloses a method of operating an automated banking machine adapted to dispense cash (fig 2 & 3) and to provide receipts for transactions conducted at the machine (24 in fig 3, par 0048), wherein the machine includes a receipt outlet (24 in fig 3, par 0048), wherein a receipt at the outlet is accessible to a user of the machine, and wherein the machine includes a receipt retraction device (1022 in fig 15B, par 0145):

However, Watari does not disclose or fairly suggest

(a) printing a first receipt with a printing device in the machine,

(b) directing the first receipt along a receipt path toward the receipt outlet,

(c) subsequent to step (b), determining either (i) the first receipt failing to reach the receipt outlet, or both (ii) the first receipt reaching the receipt outlet, and (iii) the retraction device failing to retract the first receipt,

(d) subsequent to (c), printing a second receipt through operation of the printing device, wherein the at least one second receipt sequentially follows the first receipt,

(e) directing the second receipt along the receipt path toward the receipt outlet, while the first receipt remains in the machine,

(f) subsequence of step (e), determining the second receipt failing to reach the receipt outlet,

(g) generating a receipt jam signal responsive to both (c) and (f).

Sawada however discloses

(a) printing (col 1 lines 6-10: "printers") a first paper with a printing device in the machine (S10-S12 in fig 6A),

(b) directing the first paper along a paper path toward the paper outlet (fig 2, col 4 lines 1-25: "paper transport path", "Subsequently, the paper or copy P is driven out of the copier 1."),

(c) subsequent to step (b), determining either (i) the first paper failing to reach the paper outlet (S17-S18 in fig 6B), or both (ii) the first paper reaching the paper outlet, and (iii) the retraction device failing to retract the first paper,

(d) subsequent to (c), printing a second paper through operation of the printing device, wherein the at least one second receipt paper follows the first paper (Because the steps illustrated by Sawada's fig 6 is not one time event, at least one second paper, would follow the first paper.),

(e) directing the second paper along the paper path toward the paper outlet (fig 2, col 4 lines 1-25: "paper transport path", "Subsequently, the paper or copy P is driven out of the copier 1.")

(f) subsequence of step (e), determining the second paper failing to reach the paper outlet (S17-S18 in fig 6B),

(g) generating a receipt jam signal responsive to both step (c) and step (f) (steps S20-S21 in fig 6B, col 6 lines 21-26: the pre-selected value can be any value including "2")

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Sawada's teaching in Watari's method for the purpose of determining whether a serviceman needs to be sent.

In addition, Motomura discloses directing a second paper along a paper path toward a paper outlet, while the first paper remains in the machine (col 5 lines 18-20: "two copy papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper transport path": This condition can be achieved only by a step of delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Motomura's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada for the purpose of trying to loosen the first paper jam by causing a friction with a second sheet of paper.

Re claim 23: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 22 and further comprising a sensor adapted to sense a receipt at the outlet, wherein (ii) includes sensing with the sensor the first receipt at the outlet (par 0142 0146: "independent sensor may be provided at the bill dispensing outlet").

Re claim 24: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 23 and further comprising a timer, wherein prior to (iii), timing with a the timer a time the first receipt is present at the outlet (1021 & 1015 in fig 15B).

Re claim 25: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 24 wherein (iii) includes initiating the retraction device responsive to the timer (1022 in fig 15B, par 0145).

Re claim 26: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 22 wherein (c) determines a first receipt jam event (S17-S18 in fig 6B),, wherein (f) determines a second receipt jam event (S17-S18 in fig 6B).

Re claim 27: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 22 and further comprising (h) directing the second receipt away from the outlet (1022 in fig 15B, par 0145).

Re claim 28: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 22 wherein the automated banking machine comprises an ATM, and performing steps (a)-(g) with the ATM (abst.).

Re claim 30: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 28 wherein the ATM includes a cash dispenser, and further comprising (h) dispensing an amount of cash (0002: "cash dispenser (CD)")

Re claim 32: Watari discloses an article comprising computer readable media bearing instructions executable by at least one processor (0015: "processor") in an automated banking machine including a cash dispenser (0002: "cash dispenser (CD)"), and which is operative to cause the automated banking machine to carry out a method.

However, Watari does not disclose or fairly suggest

a) sensing failure to deliver a first receipt from the machine that is associated with a first transaction conducted through operation of the machine,

b) sensing failure to deliver a second receipt from the machine that is associated with a second transaction conducted through operation of the machine sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first receipt remains in the machine,

c) generating at least one receipt events signal responsive to the occurrence of both (a) and (b).

Sawada however discloses

a) sensing failure to deliver a first paper from the machine that is associated with a first transaction conducted through operation of the machine (S17-S18 in fig 6B),

b) sensing failure to deliver a second paper from the machine that is associated with a second transaction conducted through operation of the machine sequentially immediately after the first transaction (S17 in fig 6B).

c) generating at least one paper event signal responsive to the occurrence of both (a) and (b) (steps S20-S21 in fig 6B, col 6 lines 21-26: the pre-selected value can be any value including "2").

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Sawada's teaching in Watari's article for the purpose of determining whether a serviceman needs to be dispatched.

In addition, Motomura discloses delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine (col 5 lines 18-20: "two copy

papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper transport path": This condition can be achieved only by a step of delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Motomura's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada for the purpose of trying to loosen the first paper jam by causing a friction with a second sheet of paper.

R claim 33: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the article according to claim 32, wherein the method further includes prior to (b) printing a first receipt associated with the first transaction through operation of a printer in the machine (Sawada: S10 in fig 6A), and moving the first receipt adjacent to a receipt outlet of the machine (Sawada: fig 2, col 4 lines 1-25: "paper transport path", "Subsequently, the paper or copy P is driven out of the copier 1.").

Re claim 34: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the article according to claim 33 wherein the method further includes prior to (b) operating a retraction device to attempt to retract the first receipt into the machine away from the receipt outlet (1022 in fig 15B, par 0145).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watari (US 20010003345 A1) modified by Sawada (US 5835816 A) and Motomura (US 4521102 A) in view of Howard (US 20020126849 A1).

Re claim 4: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein in (a) at least one jam event indication involves at least one receipt.

However, Watari does not disclose or fairly suggest that the receipt is a dummy receipt.

Howard however discloses a dummy form for printing a test pattern.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Howard's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura for the purpose of testing too verify either that a jam problem does nor exist or that a jam problem has been repaired before allowing the ATM to print customer receipts.

5. Claims 8-10, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watari (US 20010003345 A1) modified by Sawada (US 5835816 A) and Motomura (US 4521102 A) in view of Graef (US 20020036159 A1).

Re claim 8: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 7.

However, Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura does not disclose storing in a data store user identifying data associated with a user conducting the first transaction, and storing in a data store user identifying data associated with a user conducting the second transaction.

Graef however discloses storing in a data store user identifying data associated with a user conducting a first transaction (par 0048: "biometric readers", par 0067), and storing in a data store user identifying data associated with a user conducting a second transaction (the steps would be the same as the first transaction).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Graef's teaching in the method of Watari

modified by Sawada and Motomura for the purpose of being able to authenticate and authorize user access.

Re claim 9: Watari modified by Sawada, Motomura, and Graef discloses the method according to claim 8 and prior to (a) 10 c) storing in a data store, user identifying data associated with a prior user conducting a prior transaction conducted with the machine prior to the first transaction. (Graef; par 0048, 0067: User identifying information is stored in a data store for every user transactions).

Re claim 10: Watari modified by Sawada and Graef discloses the method according to claim 9 and further comprising:

prior to step (d) storing in a data store data corresponding to an image of at least a portion of the prior user (Graef: par 0048);

wherein step (d) includes storing data corresponding to at least one input to the machine by the prior user (Graef: par 0048, 0071: "journals"), and associating the image with the at least one input (Graef: par 0048, 0071: "journals").

Re claim 12: Watari modified by Sawada, Motomura, and Graef discloses the method according to claim 9 wherein the at least one receipt events signal includes a receipt jam signal, and further comprising:

prior to step (d), storing in a data store user identifying data associated with at least one earlier user conducting a transaction with the machine prior to the prior user (Graef; par 0048, 0067: User identifying information is stored in a data store for every user transactions), and

analyzing user identifying data identifying users of the machine associated with transactions associated with an event and transactions prior an event (Graef; par 0048, 0067:

User identifying information is stored in a data store for every user transactions) for purposes of identifying who may have tampered with the machine (This desired outcome is achieved by storing user identifying information in a data store for every user transactions).

However, Watari modified by Sawada, Motomura, and Graef does not disclose that the associated event is receipt jam indications.

Watari however further discloses receipt jam indications (par 0137).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Watari's further teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada, Motomura, and Graef for the purpose of identifying particular transactions and/or particular who may have tampered with the machine.

Re claim 14: Watari modified by Sawada and Graef discloses the method according to claim 7 and prior to (a) further comprising: storing in a data store, data identifying an individual adjacent to the machine prior to the first transaction (Graef; par 0048, 0067: User identifying information is stored in a data store for every user transactions).

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watari (US 20010003345 A1) modified by Sawada (US 5835816 A) and Motomura (US 4521102 A) in view of Howard (US 20020126849 A1).

Re claim 20: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 19.

However, Watari modified by Sawada does not disclose that the second receipt comprises a dummy receipt.

Howard however discloses a dummy form for printing a test pattern.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Howard's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada for the purpose of testing to verify either that a jam problem does nor exist or that a jam problem has been repaired before allowing the ATM to print customer receipts.

7. Claims 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watari (US 20010003345A1) modified by Sawada (US 5835816 A) and Motomura (US 4521102 A) in view of Brannan (US 5850075 A).

Re claim 29: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 28 wherein (d) includes a transaction carried out through operation of the ATM on the second receipt.

However, Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura does not disclose printing indicia.

Brannan however discloses printing indicia (col 20 lilne 28: "indicia are printed on the paper").

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Brannan's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura for the purpose of allowing being read by an indicia reader.

Re claim 31: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 30 and further comprising associating with the amount of cash dispensed in (h) on one of the first receipt and the second receipt.

However, Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura does not disclose printing indicia.

Brannan however discloses printing indicia (col 20 lilne 28: "indicia are printed on the paper").

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Brannan's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura for the purpose of allowing being read by an indicia reader.

8. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watari (US 20010003345A1) modified by Sawada (US 5835816 A) and Motomura (US 4521102 A) in view of Fukuda (JP 2003157465 A).

Re claim 35: Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura discloses the method according to claim 18.

However, Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura does not disclose or fairly suggest the second receipt comprises a dummy receipt, and further comprising: prior to step (a), storing the dummy receipt in the machine

Fukuda however discloses storing the dummy receipt in the machine (Solution :"The main control part supplies a test bill stored in the storage").

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinarily skill in the art to incorporate Fukuda's teaching in the method of Watari modified by Sawada and Motomura for the purpose of being able to test the functionality of ATM without affecting customer accounts.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In contrary to the applicant's argument, Motomura discloses delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine in Column 5 lines 18-20 ("two copy papers are sequentially jammed in the transporting direction of the copy paper transport path.") This condition can be achieved only by delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine. Applicant argues that this section of Motomura teaches only about adjusting feed counter due to the number of jammed sheets removed. While that is also true, these are related facts. Motomura's feed counter is adjusted by 2 as a result of the steps of delivering a second paper sequentially immediately after the first transaction, while the first paper remains in the machine.

Examiner disagrees with the applicant's argument that Sawada and Motomura are not analogous references. The claims are focused on the aspect of handling jams in processing printed paper sheets in the context of processing receipts in an automated banking machine. One in the ordinary skill in the art would look to the printed paper sheets processing art for clues as to how paper sheet jams had been handled in the past.

In addition, Affidavit dated 3/6/09 has been fully considered, but the Affidavit only presented conclusory remarks and did not present any new factual evidence; therefore it was not persuasive.

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAE W. KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve S. Paik can be reached on 571-272-2404. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tae W Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2887
/Karl D Frech/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2887